

paid, on the system actually employed. When, for example, a Local authority takes over a Gas company or acquires property for street widening or other social purposes. When it takes place, the administration of the industries and services thus socialised will not be bureaucratic, but effected through *ad hoc* National Boards, decentralised in method, and providing for participation in control by the workers at every stage. Such socialisation of the means of common life depends on which carries with it not the abolition of private ownership in the articles of daily use, but the extension of private ownership to millions not excluded. To the Socialist the clear demarcation of the boundaries of private property implies its maintenance and its endorsement,³⁵ even its large increase, outside the area of what J. A. Hobson has called "improper" property in the instruments of production. Those instruments will be socialised, so, property in other things will, for the first time, be a possibility for the many, saving will go on, and capital thereby be provided.

The transition period they frankly foresee, is dangerous and difficult.

"What is needed to avert the possible disasters of the transition period is a development of the spirit of social service, on the one hand, and of science on the other."

More science in the organisation of production—and production, they underline, not of material commodities only—is indispensable. Since they write, indeed, science has been applied exclusively and intensively to material productivity,

with the result that' over-production^J is
bringing our \\world
to starvation They foresaw, in 1920, that the
essential
dilemma is not merely that distribution has
not been
correlated to the new products e efficiency,
but that minds
seem inadequate to the vast task of coping
with the new
control over matter that is at their disposal
So, they \\rite